

complained of John Grancy yesterday before Judge Fox of the Second District for having, about 1 o'clock yesterday morning, entered her room through the window. She was awakened by the surprised burglar in his efforts to obtain some money which was beneath the pillow of her bed. She inquired what he wanted, when he pretended to be drunk, and she had him arrested. He was held for examination.

LAW INTELLIGENCE.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT—Sext.

DIRECTION IN ADMIRALTY, U.S.A.L.

J. GREENE, Esq., Plaintiff, vs. J. GRIFFIN.

NELSON, C. J.—That this case was filed to recover the sum of \$22 of furniture shipped on board the steamer "Globe" at this port, and consigned to the steamer "Globe" at the port, the non-delivery of which by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, with the appurtenances, were discharged at the Custom-House wharf and were received into the Custom-House, prepared to inspection and payment of duties, and that while they were seized by the Revenue-Customs, the same were released by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, for which it had no record, and that the amount of \$22.00, the said plaintiff, recovered against the said defendant, reaches the costs and disbursements of the action.

W.M. MCKEAG, Plaintiff's Attorney, No. 24 Broad-st, N. Y.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.—Tuesday, Sept. 14.—*Re: J. GREENE, Plaintiff, vs. J. GRIFFIN.*

The plaintiff brought this suit in this Court to-day for the recovery of \$22 of furniture shipped on board the steamer "Globe" at this port, and consigned to the steamer "Globe" at the port, the non-delivery of which by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, with the appurtenances, were discharged at the Custom-House wharf and were received into the Custom-House, prepared to inspection and payment of duties, and that while they were seized by the Revenue-Customs, the same were released by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, for which it had no record, and that the amount of \$22.00, the said plaintiff, recovered against the said defendant, reaches the costs and disbursements of the action.

J. GREENE, Esq., Plaintiff, vs. J. GRIFFIN.

NELSON, C. J.—That this case was filed to recover the sum of \$22 of furniture shipped on board the steamer "Globe" at this port, and consigned to the steamer "Globe" at the port, the non-delivery of which by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, with the appurtenances, were discharged at the Custom-House wharf and were received into the Custom-House, prepared to inspection and payment of duties, and that while they were seized by the Revenue-Customs, the same were released by the steamer "Globe" to the steamer "Globe" of Boston, for which it had no record, and that the amount of \$22.00, the said plaintiff, recovered against the said defendant, reaches the costs and disbursements of the action.

W.M. MCKEAG, Plaintiff's Attorney, No. 24 Broad-st, N. Y.

COURT OF SPECIAL SESSIONS.—Sept. 14th, 1858.—Before Justice BRENNAN, CONNOLLY AND STEEKS.

Number of cases 78; convictions 22.

William Mackrell, pleading a disorderly house; Penitentiary two months, and fine \$100. Leopold L. Brown, assault with intent to do great bodily harm; Penitentiary six months. Charles White, stealing a piece of ribbon, thirty days. John Burke, assault and battery; one month. Charles Aerts, stealing sugar; one month. Ann O'Neal, steel shoes; judgment suspended. John Hayes, assault and battery; one month. Martin DeBelle, stealing a tub six months. Daniel O'Conor, stealing pantaloons; six months. Mary Warren, stealing feathers; six months. Joseph Morton, stealing shirts; six months. Timothy O'Farrell, assault and battery; six months. Michael Egan, assault and battery; one month. Charles Fox, stealing money six months. Andreas Werner, stealing a shirt; remanded. John Williams, stealing money; six months. John Morris, stealing money; six months. Patrick Riley, assault and battery; two charges, remanded. Paddy Spillane, assault and battery, remanded.

MARRIED.

CUSHING-HODKINSON.—In Brooklyn, on Saturday, Sept. 13, by the Rev. W. H. Lewis, Henry K. Cushing to Katie H.

John G. Hodkinson, of the Northern District of New-York, a son in law in the Northern District of New-York, who is a builder in the Northern District of New-York.

DE GRASSE.—At New York, N. J., on Sunday evening, Sept. 12, by the Rev. Mr. Barnard of New York, Edmund DeGroot of Toledo, Ohio, and Anna only daughter of Joe Evans, son of the former place.

DE LAMOTHE.—At New York, N. Y., on Sept. 5, by the Rev. Mr. DeLamoth, Wm. Broek to Morris Winstoll, only daughter of John T. Conroy, all of this city.

KIRKLAND-THORN.—In this city on Monday, Sept. 15, at Calvary Church, the Rev. Mr. Kirkland to Elizabeth Kirkland, wife of the Rev. Mr. Kirkland, all of this city.

LEWIS-PHELPS.—At Ottawa, Ill., on Wednesday, Sept. 7, by the Rev. J. G. Atterbury, William L. Lewis of New-Albany, Ind., to Ann Eliza, daughter of Peter Phelps, esp. of this city.

RODRIGUEZ-CHATEAU.—On Monday, Sept. 13, by the Rev. Fr. Pierre, William Rodriguez to Louise Chateau, all of this city.

TAYLOR-BRIST.—On Wednesday, Sept. 7, in East Cohoes, N.Y., at the residence of his mother, by the Rev. E. Vodder, Mr. John L. Stanton of Middleburgh, Schenectady County, N. Y., to Miss Delia M. Brist of the same place.

WHITE-INFIELD.—On Monday, Sept. 13, by the Rev. Mr. Emily T. P. T. Smith of Nashville, Tenn., to Miss Anna Steinfield of this city.

TAYLOR-TYSON.—On Sunday, Sept. 12, by the Rev. Let Jones, Mr. R. R. Taylor to Marion H. Tyson, second daughter of the late Fletcher Tyson, all of this city.

VANRANT-STOOD.—On Sunday, Sept. 12, by the Rev. J. R. Stoddard, Mr. Horace E. Van Rant to Miss Anna Stoddard, all of this city.

WATERS-ZOLOZSKIE.—On Monday, Sept. 13, at the Parsonage of the Greenock-street M. E. Church, by the Rev. Wm. P. Curtis, Mrs. Samuel Waters to Miss Elizabeth Zolozskie, all of this city.

WATSON-GARRICK.—At the residence of the Rev. J. Greenleaf, Mr. John Waters to Miss Amis Garrick Garrison, eldest daughter of Charles S. Garrison, esp. of Brooklyn.

DIED.

ABBOT.—In Brooklyn, on Monday Morning, Sept. 12, aged 39 years, Dr. Jonathan Abbot.

BROWNE.—Tuesday morning, Sept. 14, after a short and severe illness, at her residence, No. 7 Carroll place, Dr. William Browne, aged 60 years.

The friends and relatives of the deceased, and those of his family, will be present at the funeral service, to be held on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

The following is a copy of the complaints:

The Board of Commissioners of Excise for the City and County of New-York, vs.—The Board of Commissioners of Excise for the City and County of New-York, ss.—A resident of the said city and county, complainant, of ——, a resident of the said city and county, defendant in the said action, shows that, as plaintiff is informed and believes, he has been compelled, at or about the time of ——, to pay to M. Brown, ——, who was the friend of man; to whom a few weeks ago he gave a sum of money, to be used for his support.

The defendants take the ground that the Court have no jurisdiction in the case that the power is left with the State until Congress interdicts the same.

Mr. John W. Reynolds, who opened the case for plaintiff this morning, and occupied the whole day reading a large volume of testimony. After the reading he will communicate his argument. He will be followed by Mr. John W. Reynolds on the other side.

THE SUITS AGAINST THE LIQUOR DEALERS.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—Sept. 14.

Mr. Robert Holmes, counsel to the Board of Excise Commissioners, has commenced several suits against parties for violations of the Excise Law. The following is a copy of the complaints:

The Board of Commissioners of Excise for the City and County of New-York, vs.—The Board of Commissioners of Excise for the City and County of New-York, ss.—A resident of the said city and county, complainant, of ——, a resident of the said city and county, defendant in the said action, shows that, as plaintiff is informed and believes, he has been compelled, at or about the time of ——, to pay to M. Brown, ——, who was the friend of man; to whom a few weeks ago he gave a sum of money, to be used for his support.

The defendants take the ground that the Court have no jurisdiction in the case that the power is left with the State until Congress interdicts the same.

Mr. John W. Reynolds, who opened the case for plaintiff this morning, and occupied the whole day reading a large volume of testimony. After the reading he will communicate his argument. He will be followed by Mr. John W. Reynolds on the other side.

The plaintif claims that the act of incorporation conflicts with the Constitution of the United States, and is therefore void, and he has therefore caused to be filed a bill in equity, to restrain the plaintiff from deriving any benefit from his charter.

The plaintif also claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.

The plaintif further claims that the act of incorporation is unconstitutional.